



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,460	09/29/2006	Mitsunari Suzuki	125764	9279
25944 7590 05/19/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
LE, DON P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2819				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/594,460

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI, MITSUNARI

Examiner

Don P. Le

Art Unit

2819

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/26/2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masami et al. (JP 05-121988).

3. With respect to claim 1, figure 6 of Masami teaches a noise suppression circuit suppressing normal mode noise transmitted on first and second conductive lines and generating a potential difference between the first and the second conductive lines, comprising:

first (55) and second (75) inductors inserted in series in the first conductive line and magnetically coupled to each other; and

a series circuit configured to have a third inductor (65) and a first capacitor (66) connected in series, one end of the series circuit being connected to a junction of the first and second inductors, and other end being connected to the second conductive line.

Masami is silent as to a range of value of the coupling coefficient k . It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have designed the apparatus of Masami with a coupling coefficient k

between the first and second inductors is smaller than 1, and the inductance of the third inductor is set to a value so that a desired noise attenuation characteristic is realized on condition that the coupling coefficient k is smaller than 1, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

4. With respect to claims 2-4, applicant claims specific values for the various components in the apparatus to obtain desired output results. As shown in the rejection of claim 1 above. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

5. Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noritoshi et al. (JP 02-206360).

6. With respect to claim 5, figure 1 of Noritoshi discloses a noise suppression circuit suppressing normal mode noise transmitted on first and second conductive lines and generating a potential difference between the first and the second conductive lines, comprising:

first (37A) and second (57A) inductors inserted in series in the first conductive line and magnetically coupled to each other;

a series circuit configured to have a third inductor (57B) and a first capacitor (59) connected in series; and

fourth (38A) and fifth (58A) inductors inserted in series in the second conductive line and magnetically coupled to each other,

wherein one end of the series circuit is connected to a junction of the first and second inductors, and the other end is connected to a junction of the fourth and fifth inductors.

Noritoshi is silent as to a range of value of the coupling coefficients k_1 and k_2 and specific value of the third inductor to obtain a desired result. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have designed the apparatus of Noritoshi each of a coupling coefficient k_1 between the first and second inductors and a coupling coefficient k_2 between the fourth and fifth inductors is smaller than 1, and the inductance of the third inductor is set to a value so that a desired noise attenuation characteristic is realized on condition that each of the coupling coefficients k_1 and k_2 is smaller than 1, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

7. With respect to claims 6-8, applicant claims specific values for the various components in the apparatus to obtain desired output results. As shown in the rejection of claim 1 above. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

8. With respect to claims 9-12, the reasoning for rejection is the same as claim 5 above. Since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Don P. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1806. The examiner can normally be reached on 7AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Barnie Rexford can be reached on 571-272-1812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Don P Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2819
5/13/2008